impenetrably closed to agrarian grievances. Nor was it only the political and economic environment which had changed. The revolution in thought was equally profound. The theoretical basis of the policy of protecting the peasant by preventing enclosure had been a conception of landownership which regarded its rights and its duties as inextricably interwoven. Property was not merely a source of income, but a public function, and its use was limited by social obligations and necessities of State. With such a doctrine the classes who had taken the lead in the struggle against the monarchy could make no truce. Its last vestiges finally disappeared when the Restoration Parliament swept away military tenures, and imposed on the nation, in the shape of an excise, the financial burden previously borne by themselves*

The theory which took its place, and which was to become in the eighteenth century almost a religion, was that expressed by Locke, when he described property as a right anterior to the existence of the State, and argued that " the supreme power cannot take from any man ,any part of his property without his own consent.[j'] But Locke merely poured into a philosophical mould ideas which had been hammered out in the stress of political struggles, and which were already the commonplace of landowner and merchant*

The view of society held by that part of the Puritan movement which was socially and politically influential had bee& expressed by Ireton and Cromwell in their retort **to** the democrats in the army. It was that only the freeholders really constituted the body politic, and that they could use their property as they pleased* uncontrolled by obligations to any superior, or by the need of consulting the mass of men, who were mer$ tenants at will, with no fixed interest or share in the land of the kingdom,[111] Naturally, this change of ideas' had profound reactions on agrarian policy. Formerly a course commending itself to all public-spirited person^